

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MAINE**

VISIONMASTER, INC.,)	
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	
v.)	Civil No. 2:14-cv-224-NT
)	
ASC INTERNATIONAL,)	
)	
Defendant.)	

**ORDER AFFIRMING THE
RECOMMENDED DECISION OF THE MAGISTRATE JUDGE**

The United States Magistrate Judge filed with the Court on December 3, 2014 his Recommended Decision (ECF No. 11). The Plaintiff filed its Objection to the Recommended Decision (ECF No. 12) on December 17, 2014. Defendant filed its Response to the Plaintiff's Objection (ECF No. 13) on December 31, 2014. Without seeking permission pursuant to Local Rule 72.1, the Plaintiff filed a Reply brief (ECF No. 14).¹

I have reviewed and considered the Magistrate Judge's Recommended Decision, together with the entire record; I have made a *de novo* determination of all matters adjudicated by the Magistrate Judge's Recommended Decision; and I concur with the recommendations of the United States Magistrate Judge for the reasons set forth in his Recommended Decision, and determine that no further proceeding is

¹ As the Court has considered all the filings in making its *de novo* review. The Court denies as **MOOT** the Defendant's motion to disregard the Plaintiff's Reply brief. Defendant's Objection to Filing of Reply Brief (ECF No. 15).

necessary. It is therefore **ORDERED** that the Recommended Decision of the Magistrate Judge is hereby **AFFIRMED**.

SO ORDERED.

/s/ Nancy Torresen
United States Chief District Judge

Dated this 28th day of January, 2015.